

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/988,002	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BJORKSTEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jonathan Ouellette	<b>Art Unit</b> 3629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):-

(1) Jonathan Ouellette.

(3) Ross Dannenberg.

(2) John Weiss (SPE).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent Claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: MValue.com.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dannenberg explained the current commercial embodiment of the invention. Mr. Dannenberg further explained his perceived differences between the Mvalue reference and the instant invention - specifically the incorporation of multiple profile databases, to include one master profile database and a multiple number of service profile databases which corresponded to specific personal/business interests. Mr. Weiss, Examiner Ouellette and Mr. Dannenberg reached an agreement on amended claim language that would overcome the prior art disclosed by the Mvalue reference.